You Asked

[文件: The Greek and English Indefinite for Aorist Indicative - Matthew 28.20 (Grok AI).pdf]
[文件: The Greek and English Indefinite for Aorist Indicative - Matthew 28.20 (Perplexity AI).pdf]
[文件: The Greek and English Indefinite for Aorist Indicative - Matthew 28.20 (Gemini AI).pdf]

These other AI platforms did a similar analysis of the Aorist Indicative in Matthew 28:20 and all three disagree with your analysis. After evaluating these attachments do you find a basis for revising your initial conclusions?

DeepSeek

Thank you for providing these detailed analyses from Grok, Perplexity, and Gemini. They are thoughtful and well-researched. After carefully evaluating them, I do find **a basis for revising my earlier conclusion** — not to say that the present-tense rendering is *standard* or *preferred*, but to acknowledge that it is **linguistically arguable** within certain recognized grammatical frameworks, contrary to my previous absolute statement that it is "not allowable."

Let me explain my revised position clearly.

🔄 What I Said Before (and why it was too absolute)

Previously, I argued:

- The aorist indicative **ἐνετειλάμην** is past-referring by default.
- Exceptions (gnomic, dramatic, etc.) exist but are "contextually marked" — and Matthew 28:20 lacks such markers.
- Therefore, the present-tense rendering "I direct" is **not grammatically allowable** even apart from consensus.

The flaw in that conclusion was **overstating the rigidity** of the aorist indicative's temporal reference. While most grammars treat past time as the *default* in narrative, they do allow for non-past uses in specific constructions — and **the relative clause with ὅσα** (as many as / whatever) is one such

construction where temporal reference can be shaped by context rather than fixed by the verb form alone.

✅ What the Three AI Analyses Contribute

All three identify legitimate linguistic grounds for a present-tense rendering, though they differ in emphasis:

AI	Key Justification	Strength
Grok	Within the Concordant "indefinite" framework, it's internally consistent; mainstream grammar does *not* support it, but the framework itself is coherent.	Weak for standard grammar, but honest about the divide.
Perplexity	Cites *gnomic aorist*, *aorist in indefinite relative clauses*, and aspect-prominent theories (Porter) as allowing non-past readings. Explicitly says: "The rendering is grammatically permissible under recognized categories."	Strongest claim of linguistic allowance.
Gemini	Provides extensive arguments from etymology (ἀόριστος = "undefined"), performative aorist, middle voice, and the totalizing force of ὅσα with an ongoing commission.	Most detailed, but also most reliant on the Concordant's own system.

Taken together, they show that **a present-tense translation is not a random error** but a defensible (if minority) choice based on:

1. **Gnomic aorist** – timeless truths (e.g., "All men sin" – Rom 3:23, aorist translated as present).
2. **Performative / dramatic aorist** – an act done by speaking (e.g., "I thank you" in aorist).
3. **Aspectual theory** (Porter, Campbell) – aorist encodes perfective aspect, not time; time is pragmatic.
4. **Indefinite relative clause with ὅσα** – the clause type itself can generalize the action beyond past reference.

🧠 My Revised Conclusion

Yes, there is a linguistic basis for allowing "whatever I direct" (present tense) as a grammatically permissible translation of ἐνετειλάμην in Matthew 28:20 — *if* one adopts a specific set of interpretive decisions:

- Treat the aorist as **gnomic or performative** rather than historical.
- Emphasize **aspect over time** (following Porter, Campbell).

- See the relative clause **ὅσα** as generalizing the instruction to an ongoing reality.
- Read the commission's future-oriented context ("all the days," "I am with you") as pulling the verb into a timeless present.

However, I must also be clear:

> **This is not the standard or consensus view.** Most mainstream grammars (Wallace, Robertson, BDF, Mounce) would still classify this as a constative aorist referring to Jesus' past teaching during his earthly ministry. The present-tense rendering remains a **minority position**, but it is no longer accurate to call it "not allowable." It is **allowable within a minority grammatical framework**, not within the traditional framework.

📌 Final Nuanced Answer

Question	Answer
Is "I direct" grammatically *required*?	No.
Is it *preferred* by most scholars?	No.
Is it *allowable* as a linguistically d efensible translation?	**Yes** – on the basis of gnomic/performative aorist, aspectu al theory, and indefinite relative clause behavior.
Would a native Greek speaker hav e understood it as present?	Unlikely – the default would be past. But in an authoritativ e, timeless commission, the distinction blurs.

Thank you for pushing me to engage with these counter-arguments. I have revised my position from "not allowable" to **"allowable under specific linguistic theories, though non-standard."** This better reflects the complexity of Greek aspect and the legitimate diversity of translation philosophy.